

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/562,060 | 12/22/2005 | Atsushi Umekage | 1248-0844PUS1 | 9644 |
| | 7590 06/01/200 ART KOLASCH & BI | EXAMINER | | |
| PO BOX 747 | | | MAMO, ELIAS | |
| FALLS CHUR | CH, VA 22040-0747 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2184 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/01/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/562,060 | UMEKAGE ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| ELIAS MAMO | 2184 | | |

| | ELIAS MAMO | 2184 | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. \(\to \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection The period for reply expires our. (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In or event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLAY SET LEAD | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i | o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | FIRST REPLY WAS FI | LED WITHIN TWO | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above; if checket. A vry reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for | | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reig | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendmen | nt canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7, 9, 10 and 31-33</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See the attached | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | /Henry W.H. Tsai/ Supervisory Patent B | Examiner, Art Un | it 2184 | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Applicants argued that "In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the information processing device of the claimed invention reads on the combination of printer 50 and print load distribution apparatus 80 disclosed in Gassho. See Office Action, pages 2-3; Gassho, Figure 3. According to the Examiner's interpretation of Gassho in this manner, it follows that "a particular address of the information processing device" as now recited in claim 1 would correspond to a particular address of the combination of printer 50 and print load distribution apparatus 80." (Fage 6, last paragraph)

The Examiner disagrees with the above statement. The Examiner did not allege that the information processing device of the claimed invention reads on the combination of printer 50 and print load distribution apparatus 80 disclosed in Gassho. There is none said in pages 2.3 of the final Office Action.

Applicants argued that "Cassho does not teach or suggest changing the manner in which a print job (received data) is handled depending on whether the destination address of the print job is a specific address (common address for the information processing device and one or more information processing devices) or a particular address of the information processing device itself. Therefore, Gassho cannot obviate these features of independent claim 1." (Page 7. paragraph 4).

The Examiner disagrees with the above statement. O'Riordan discloses using a specific address as a shared address in order to address the information processing device or to address one or more other information processing devices. Thus, the combined teachings of Gassho and O'Riordan do suggest the features of the claimed invention where the frame analysis section (i.e.-network control circuit 80e, col. 10, lines 16-17) capable of analyzing whether the received data is data transmitted to a particular address of the information processing device or not, and, when the O'Riordan teaching is combined to Gassho, it also analyzes that the received data is transmitted to the specific address or not, and wherein the registration processing section adds and registers all the data transmitted to the particular address into the storage section (Note: Joh receiver unit 01 receives the print jobs and stores it in a buffer, col. 10, lines 39-45).